

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-11 are pending and under consideration in the above-identified application. In the Office Action of March 18, 2009, claims 1-11 were rejected. Claims 12-24 were previously withdrawn and remain withdrawn.

With this Amendment, claims 1-10 are amended.

#### **I. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims**

Claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bianco et al.* (US 6,256,737) . Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In relevant part, independent claim 1 recites an information processing apparatus which receives a person identification certificate from a person identification unit and stores the person identification certificate issued from the person identification certificate unit in the local storage device of the information processing apparatus remotely from the server.

This is clearly unlike *Bianco* which fails to disclose or even fairly suggest storing a person identification certificate received from a person identification unit **on an information processing apparatus remotely from the server**. Instead, *Bianco* discloses storing biometric **templates on a server located in a corporate office or on a server located at a local office**.

See, U.S. Pat. No. 6,256,737, Col. 54, l. 10 - Col. 55, l. 20. In addition, *Bianco* states that storing biometric templates in one location is the most efficient method of authenticating and that redundant storage of biometric templates is only necessary when an enterprise uses a WAN because of possible connectivity issues. See, U.S. Pat. No. 6,256,737, Col. 52, l. 1-44. Therefore, based on *Bianco*, one of ordinary skill in the art would be directed to store biometric

templates on a server located at a corporate office or at a local office and not on a local computer.

As the Applicant's specification teaches, by providing an information processing apparatus which receives a person identification certificate from a person identification unit and stores the person identification certificate issued from the person identification certificate authority in the local storage device of the information processing apparatus remotely from the server, the network is only utilized when the person identification certificate is not on the information processing device, thereby minimizing network usage. See, Specification at Pages 81-85.

Therefore, because *Bianco* fails to disclose or even fairly suggest every feature of claim 1, the rejection of claim 1 cannot stand. Because claims 2-11 depend, either directly or indirectly from claim 1, they are allowable for at least the same reasons.

## **II. Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 18, 2009

By: /David R. Metzger/  
David R. Metzger  
Registration No. 32,919  
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP  
P.O. Box 061080  
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080  
(312) 876-8000